DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 802 CS 508 314

AUTHOR Lueck, Therese L.; And Others
TITLE Mass Communication Course Evaluations: An Exploratory Study on the Effect of Gender.
PUB DATE Aug 93
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (76th, Kansas City, MO, August 11-14, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Communication Research; Higher Education; *Mass Media; *Sex Differences; *Student Attitudes; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Bem Sex Role Inventory

ABSTRACT

An exploratory study examined the effect of gender on student evaluation ratings of journalism and mass communication instructors. Subjects were 8 professors (4 male and 4 female) who represented a wide range of teaching experience and taught a total of 243 students (108 women and 135 men) in 10 different types of classrooms. A total of 241 students completed a questionnaire consisting of five questions from regular departmental evaluation forms (the "objective" index) and the pool of the five highest loaded items for masculinity and the five highest loaded items for femininity from the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Results indicate that: (1) female teachers were rated better than male teachers on the objective index; (2) female teachers were rated significantly higher than the male teachers on the masculinity index; (3) female teachers scored better on the femininity index, but the effect was not statistically significant; (4) although the male students rated male instructors better on the objective and femininity indexes, the effects were not statistically significant; (5) female students rated female instructors higher than males on the femininity and objective indexes, with no statistically significant differences found on the masculinity index; and (6) female students did not rate instructors as a group high, and the male students did not rate instructors in general low. Findings suggest some evidence for gender bonding, or a relationship between the instructor of one gender and the students of the same gender, particularly among the females. (Contains 29 references.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 361 802

Mass Communication Course Evaluations: An Exploratory Study on the Effect of Gender

By

Therese L. Lueck, Assistant Professor

Kathleen Endres, Associate Professor

Richard E. Caplan, Assistant Professor

School of Communication

The University of Akron

Akron, Ohio 44325-1003

(216) 972-7954

Commission on the Status of Women

Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication

1993

AS508314

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Therese Lueck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mass Communication Course Evaluations: An Exploratory Study on the Effect of Gender

Introduction

Student evaluations remain a widely used method of assessing courses and the quality of teaching in higher education for personnel and merit decisions. Yet much controversy surrounds the student evaluation as a measurement of teaching effectiveness. One aspect of this controversy deals with the effect gender has on these evaluations. Does the gender of the instructor affect results on student evaluation instruments? Are female instructors at a disadvantage in the student evaluation process? Does the gender of the student have an effect on the evaluation process? This study was designed to explore answers to these and a number of other questions It focuses on the field of mass communication, a previously unexamined field with regard to this type of investigation.

Researchers were particularly interested in gauging any effects and interactions between the gender of the instructor and the gender of the student in course evaluations.

Literature Review

In retention, tenure, promotion and merit decisions, teaching performance remains an important consideration. How to measure and evaluate teaching effectiveness has long been debated in a variety of disciplines (Cashin, 1988; Arreola, 1989). A survey of 453 department heads (Centra, 1977) illustrates what has become the standard for evaluating teaching. According to that study, the input with the greatest weight in determining teaching effectiveness was the chair's evaluation. Tied for second were colleagues' opinions and systematic student ratings.

Of these three, student ratings are often accepted at face value without thought of factors -- quite apart from teaching performance -- that might influence student responses. Recent research has explored any number of variables affecting the ratings (Feldman, 1983; 1986; Marsh, 1984; Marsh and Ware, 1982).

Gender has been one of the factors examined in determining if student ratings are valid measures of teaching performance. Validity here is defined as follows: "Does the test measure what it is supposed to?" (Cashin, 1989). In the course of the research, questions of bias have surfaced, factors that negatively or positively have an impact on the results of the instrument (see Marsh, 1984: 707-54). While the research is not conclusive, a large number of studies have found that the gender of the instructor may negatively impact student ratings or, at least, influence results.

A good deal of scholarly literature explores the interaction of student gender and instuctor gender. In general, these studies have found that the male instructor was rated higher than the woman teacher. Kierstead, D'Agostino and Dill (1988), for example, found that both male and female students consistently rated their woman instructor lower than the man teacher. The respondents of both genders expected female instructors to fulfill a different standard of behavior than their male teachers, concluded the researchers. "If female instructors want to obtain high student ratings, they must be not only highly competent with regard to factors directly related to teaching but also careful to act in accordance with traditional sex role expectations. ... In particular, our results indicated that male and female instructors will earn equal SRIs [Students' Ratings of Instruction] for equal professional work only if the women also display stereotypically feminine behavior" (342-44). This negative rating of female instructors by students of

both genders tended to support earlier studies (eg: Lombardo & Tocci, 1979; Wilson & Wilson, 1976).

Other studies have found that the male students were the ones to rate female instructors in a matter different from -- and in a more harsh way than -- the male teachers. Bernard, Keefauver, Elsworth and Naylor (1981) used an experimental design to test female and male student responses to teachers. In that study, the researchers found that male students were significantly less positive in their attitudes, expectations and evaluations of female teachers than female students, and the male students consistently rated male instructors more favorably than they did the female instructors.

That finding was reinforced by Basow and Silberg (1987). In a study of more than 1,000 male and female college students of 16 male and female professors (matched for course, teaching experience and tenure), male students gave female professors significantly poorer ratings than they gave the male instructors for each of six variables. Female students rated the female professor more negatively than male teachers in only three variables.

Thus, this body of literature seems to suggest there is an interaction between gender of the student and gender of the instructor, and that this interaction affects evaluation results. According to this literature, women instructors are likely to be at a disadvantage. Certain studies have emphasized that women instructors are expected to behave in certain manners consistent with social expectations. Other studies have pointed out that the teaching function at the higher education level may run counter to accepted gender expectations. Lana Rakow (1991) pointed out that, by their very gender, women who teach on the college level transgress their traditional gender role designations, assuming instead a non-traditional role, a violation of the "natural" order or authority. Female instructors are often judged harshly by the mere fact of their gender. This hostile effect can be

somewhat mediated by the students' continued experiences with women in non-traditional roles such as university professor (Fandt & Stevens, 1991).

Another body of research examines how gender-designated societal expectations affect students. According to this body of research, students come to expect certain behaviors from their female and male instructors. The behaviors expected flow from societal expectations of the genders. Findings suggest that students expect certain stereotypical behavior from their instructors. Female teachers are expected to conform to culturally accepted behaviors, and those who fail to conform to those stereotypes often find themselves with negative student ratings. "Nurturing" and a close interpersonal relationship with students fall within this cultural expectation.

Bennett's study (1982) of 253 students illustrates such research. Bennett found that women instructors were perceived as warmer (a highly loaded female characteristic [Bem, 1981]) within the classroom. Yet students demanded a greater amount of interpersonal support and held women to a stricter standard of accessibility. While Bennett did not detect any direct gender biases in the formal student evaluations, she speculated that female faculty members were subject to "cultural conditioned gender stereotypes" (170-9).

That expectation for a higher degree of interpersonal contact from female instructors was also found by Cooper, Stewart and Gudykunst (1982) in their study. Interpersonal contact as a variable had far more importance in the student's judgment of female instructors than male instructors. "[W]omen are caring and sensitive while men are competent," the authors concluded, pointing to societal stereotypes. "When evaluating instructors, students give greater significance to the type of interpersonal responses they receive from female instructors while giving greater significance to the accuracy of the grade they receive from male instructors" (pp. 308-15).

These findings, however, remain controversial -- not because the research designs are faulty or the results are invalid -- but because this remains a fairly new area of investigation. Other studies, while acknowledging culturally conditioned gender stereotypes, have not definitively shown that this is reflected in student evaluations. Even Bennett (1982) could not detect direct gender biases although she detected differing student expectations of instructors -- depending on gender.

A similar point was made by Elmore and LaPointe (1974). The two detected no interaction between the faculty member's gender and the student's gender and no differences between the mean ratings given male and female faculty by students. Yet, these researchers emphasized that many variables had been left uncontrolled in their study. These variables included class size and instructor's rank.

The conflicting nature of such research has led Cashin of the Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development to conclude (1988) that gender of instructor does not appear to be a factor in student evaluations. Yet two years later, while still noting that gender showed "little or no correlation" in student evaluations, Cashin (1990) wrote, "[I]f the instructor provides evidence of his or her self-report of these variables [including gender], or if you or others have such evidence, that evidence should be taken into consideration."

In the journalism and mass communication field, there are few studies examining gender as a factor in student evaluations. This is not to say that the subject of student evaluations has not been studied in the journalism/mass communication field (Hudson, 1989).

However, the journalism and mass communication field seems to be an ideal area for such a study for several reasons. The shift in the gender of the student population combined with the slower rise -- yet increasing number --

of female faculty make this an opportune time to examine the role of gender in student evaluations. Current enrollment trends not withstanding, the journalism and mass communication professional field has traditionally been dominated by males. The only exception to this is the current employment situation in public relations (U.S. Department of Labor, 1989; AEJMC, 1989). Women instructors in journalism and mass communication on the college level still remain a minority, while female students outnumber male students nationwide. Currently, women represent only 26 percent of the full-time teaching faculty (Schamber, 1989). Journalism and mass communication also call for certain characteristics or talents that are not commonly associated with "feminine behavior." Certain production classes are technology and equipment intensive. Moreover, certain classes -- particularly in reporting -- require certain aggressive questioning and behaviors not commonly associated with feminine stereotypes (Bem, 1981). Given the special characteristics of the journalism/mass communication educational discipline and given the lack of research in this area, the time seems right for at least an exploratory study on student evaluation ratings in this field.

Methodology

Given the literature that points to different expectations of male and female instructors and the lack of evaluation-based research in the field of mass communication instruction, this research project was designed as an exploratory study of the effect of gender on student evaluation ratings. In order to gauge this effect, the researchers used one of the most widely used and widely accepted instruments, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI). The BSRI is based on extensive examination of culturally defined masculine and feminine characteristics (Bem, p. 4). For instance, based on extensive testing, Bem has found that an item, or behavioral characteristic, such as that defined by the phrase "demonstrates leadership abilities" is highly loaded as

a culturally desirable masculine characteristic. Studies through the mid-1980s verify the reliability and the internal consistency of Bem's BSRI. Yanico (1985) showed that the BSRI has at least a moderate long-term reliability. Schmitt and Millard (1988) found that while not all individuals can be shown to respond to sex-type coding, which the BSRI endeavors to chart, people do tend to use culturally defined standards of masculinity and femininity as yardsticks.

A thorough review by Spence (1991) showd that the BSRI measures broad gender concepts, that it has construct validity and that the short form (the basis for this study) eliminates the problems of the earlier longer form. Another study, by Martin and Ramanaiah (1988), also noted that the recent Bem short form is a better indicator of the culturally defined standards of masculinity and femininity than the earlier form.

A questionnaire was formed from the pool of the highest loaded BSRI items for masculinity and the highest loaded items for femininity from the short form. Statements from a pre-existing departmental form were used instead of filler questions, which are typically used in studies employing the BSRI instrument. These became known, for the purpose of this study, as the "objective" portion of the questionnaire. Since this is an exploratory study and is aimed at a new area of gender evaluation emphasis, mass communication, the items selected form Bem's short from were not only highly loaded masculine or feminine characteristics but also those with potential for direct application to the mass communication classroom situation. For example, one highly loaded feminine characteristic selected was "eager to soothe hurt feelings," instead of another highly loaded feminine characteristic such as "affectionate."

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. Student ratings of female instructors on the objective portion of the questionnaire will be lower than the student ratings of male instructors.

2. Student ratings of female instructors will be lower on the BSRI masculinity characteristics index than will those for male instructors.

3. Student ratings of male instructors will be lower on the BSRI femininity characteristics index than will those for the female instructors.

4. Male students will rate male instructors higher on all three indexes used on the questionnaire than they will the female instructors.

5. Female students will rate female instructors higher on all three indexes used on the questionnaire than they will the male instructors.

6. Female students will rate both female and male instructors higher on all three indexes used on the questionnaire than will male students.

In designing a research method to test these hypotheses, the researchers were mindful of cautions expressed in earlier studies. A number of researchers (Elmore & LaPointe, 1974; Basow & Silberg, 1987) have emphasized the need to not just compare evaluation results of men and women but also to match instructors by teaching experience, type of class, size of class and gender of student. For this study, the following matches were used.

Senior professors:

A man and a woman teaching advanced level media history classes (a traditional lecture type class with 18 to 23 students per section) and equipment-intensive production classes (with 13 students per section).

Mid-career professors:

A man and a woman teaching large, introductory Mass Communication survey classes (with 52 to 70 students per section).

A man and a woman teaching Research Methods classes (with 17 to 19 students per section).

Part-time Instructors:

A male and a female working professional teaching Newswriting classes (with 11 to 12 students per section).

All classes were offered in one midwestern School of Communication. Students in each of these classes represented the population of this exploratory study. All students present on the day the questionnaire was administered responded, although participation was voluntary. The questionnaire was administered by one of the researchers to each class within a two-week time span in the middle of one of two semesters (Spring 1992 and Fall 1992). The instructor was not in the room when this questionnaire was administered.

Each student was asked to respond on the Likert scale as to his or her degree of agreement with each of 15 statements pertaining to the instructor in that classroom situation. Five of those items were defined by Bem as feminine and five as masculine. The other five were standard questions from the departmental evaluation, forming the so-called objective portion.

This study included eight different professors (four males and four females). These individuals represented a wide range of experience in the classroom (see breakdown above), from senior faculty with decades of teaching experience to part-time working professionals with little teaching experience. In addition, all instructors had professional experience. This study also included 10 different types of classes (from equipment-intensive classes, i.e., production and newswriting courses, to large lecture classes, i.e., introductory Mass Communication Survey classes) or 20 different sections of these classes. These classes also represented a wide range of sizes from the small newswriting classes to the larger classes. The total number of students who filled out the part of the evaluation on which they were asked to indicate gender was 243; of these, 108 were women and 135 were men. The female

instructors had 61 male students and 65 female students; the male instructors had 74 male students and 43 female students. These totals are based on six cases missing.

A total 249 sheets were entered into the computer and analyzed using SPSS. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the hypotheses on the relationships among independent variables and dependent variables. Analysis was based on the evaluations from the 241 subjects who completed all indexes on the questionnaire. The independent variables were the gender of the student, gender of the instructor and the type of course. This produced a 2x2 factorial design. A separate analysis of variance was run for each of the three indexes. The independent variables were gender of teacher (male and female), and gender of student (male and female). The dependent variable was the rating of teachers on a masculinity index, a femininity index and the objective index.

Results

H1: Student ratings of female instructors on the objective portion of the questionnaire will be lower than the student ratings of male instructors.

The findings revealed a statistically significant difference for the main effect of gender of teacher ($F = 22.8$, $df = 1$). However, the mean for male teachers was 12.6 and the mean for female teachers was 10.2. The lower score shows a higher level of agreement since "strongly agree" was coded as 1 and "strongly disagree" was coded as 5. H1 must be rejected. The opposite of what was hypothesized occurred -- female teachers were rated better than the male teachers on the objective scale.

H2: Student ratings of female instructors will be lower on the BSRI masculinity characteristics index than will those for male instructors.

There was a significant difference for the main effect of gender of teacher ($F = 29.2$, $df = 1$). The mean for male instructors was 13.4, while the

mean for female instructors was 10.9, with the lower score indicating a better rating by students. Here again, the hypothesis must be rejected because the opposite of what was hypothesized was found. Female teachers were rated significantly better than the male teachers on the masculinity index.

H3: Student ratings of male instructors will be lower on the BSRI femininity characteristics index than will those for the female instructors.

There was no significant difference in the main effect for gender of teacher ($F = 5.0$, $df = 1$), at the $\alpha = .01$. However, there is some evidence that female teachers scored better on the femininity index than male teachers, with the mean for female instructors equal to 12.9 and the mean for the male instructor equal to 14.2. But the difference was not statistically significant; therefore, this hypothesis must be rejected.

H4: Male students will rate male instructors higher on all three indexes used in the questionnaire than they will female instructors.

This hypothesis was tested by evaluation of the two-way interaction in the analysis of variance table. On the masculinity index, there was no significant difference for the two-way interaction effect ($F = .7$, $df = 1$). On the femininity index, there was a significant difference for the two-way interaction effect ($F = 10.6$, $df = 1$). The mean rating of male instructors by male students was 13.7, and the mean rating of female instructors by male students was 13.9. To test for the significance of this difference, Scheffe's test was employed. Although the male students did rate the male instructors better on the femininity index, no significant difference was found, at $\alpha = .05$ (critical value = 1.6).

On the objective index, there was a significant difference for the two-way interaction effect ($F = 8.8$, $df = 1$). The mean rating of male instructors by male students was equal to 12.1, and the mean rating of female instructors by male students was equal to 11.1. To test for the significance of this difference,

Scheffe's test was employed. Although the male students did rate the male instructors better on the objective index, no significant difference was found, at $\alpha = .05$ (critical value = 1.6).

H5: Female students will rate female instructors higher on all three indexes used on the questionnaire than they will the male instructors.

This hypothesis was tested by evaluation of the two-way interaction in the analysis of variance table. On the masculinity index, there was no significant difference for the two-way interaction effect ($F = .7$, $df = 1$). On the femininity index, there was a significant difference for the two-way interaction effect ($F = 10.6$, $df = 1$). The mean rating of female instructors by female students was 12.1, and the mean rating of male instructors by female students was 15.2. To test for the significance of this difference, Scheffe's test was employed. A significant difference was found, at $\alpha = .05$ (critical value = 1.9). The female students rated the female instructors significantly better on the femininity index.

On the objective index, there was a significant difference for the two-way interaction effect ($F = 8.8$, $df = 1$). The mean rating of female instructors by female students was equal to 9.5, and the mean rating of male instructors by female students was equal to 13.4. To test for the significance of this difference, Scheffe's test was employed. A significant difference was found, at $\alpha = .05$ (critical value = 1.8). The female students rated the female instructors significantly better on the objective index.

With regard to H4 and H5, there appears to be a relationship between the gender of the teacher and how a student of the same gender rates the quality of that instructor's teaching.

H6: Female students will rate both male and female instructors higher on all indexes used on the questionnaire than will the male students.

This hypothesis was rejected. The hypothesis was tested by evaluating the main effect for gender of student. For the masculinity index, no significant difference was found, at $\alpha = .01$ ($F = 0.3$, $df = 1$). For the femininity index, no significant difference was found, at $\alpha = .01$ ($F = 0.09$, $df = 1$). For the objective index, no significant difference was found, at $\alpha = .01$ ($F = 0.2$, $df = 1$). As seen in H4 and H5, there is an interaction between the gender of the student and the gender of the instructor. In other words, there was an interaction between the gender of the instructor and the gender of the student so that male students rated male teachers higher and female students rated female teachers higher. However, considered by itself, the gender of the student was not a factor that affected how instructors were evaluated on the masculinity, femininity or objective index. In other words, the female students did not rate instructors as a group high, and the male students did not rate instructors in general low.

Discussion

Same-gender bonding between the instructors and students was demonstrated on the course evaluations. Not only did the male students rate the male instructors higher, but the female students rated the female instructors higher. The opposite of these statements, of course, is also true. While the male students did not rate the instructors as a whole worse than did the female students, they did consistently rate the male instructors higher. While the female students did not rate the instructors as a whole better than did the male students, they did consistently rate the female professors higher than they did the male professors.

Some ironic and certainly unexpected results emerged in the findings of this exploratory study. While female teachers were rated better on all the indexes, the concept of "better" must be discussed. While female teachers were rated significantly better by the student population on the so-called

objective index, they were rated only slightly better, or not significantly different from the male teachers, on the femininity index. This indicates that the students found the female teachers to adhere to culturally desirable feminine characteristics, such as "eager to soothe hurt feelings," slightly more than the male teachers. However, the female teachers were rated significantly higher on the masculinity index than were the male teachers by the student population, which indicates that the students perceived the female instructors as adhering more to traditionally desirable gender expectations of males than did the males. Perhaps some of this can be accounted for by the type of person drawn to the field of mass communication, and in that field's valuing of generally male-identified tendencies such as aggressiveness in reporting and technological competency in production.

On the masculinity index, the women were rated significantly higher by the student population than their male counterparts. In fact, every one of the women instructors was ranked better on that index than the men, who were ranked at the bottom of the masculinity index. In support of this discussion, another tendency that showed up (although not statistically significant) was for the male students to rate the male teachers better on the femininity index than they did the female teachers.

This study finds some evidence for a gender bonding, or a relationship between the instructor of one gender and the students of the same gender, particularly among the females. In fact, as was demonstrated by the results in H4 and H5, it is the female students' ratings of the instructors that creates the significant differences in the two-way interaction effects. The high ratings for the female teachers seems, then, to come from the female students, with them rating the female teachers significantly higher on both the femininity and the objective index, in a two-way interaction effect.

Conclusions

This study begins to chart the existence and significance of the interaction between the gender of the student and the gender of the instructor. It also begins to tap the effect this interaction has on the evaluation of teaching. It points out that students may be reacting to factors that have been considered peripheral to the teaching of the subject -- such as gender -- in evaluating the effectiveness of that teaching. It raises questions as to the type of identification students have with their instructors and how these factors affect both the effectiveness of teaching and the perceived effectiveness of that teaching. The study yielded some unexpected results. Perhaps the perceptions a teacher elicits from the students may depend to some extent on other factors, which may or may not be gender-ralated, such as the teacher's style of communicating (Norton 1977 qtd. in Sallinen-Kuparinen, 1992). Are the teaching styles of journalism and mass communication instructors employed those developed in the newsroom and later implemented in the classroom?

This study uncovers some intriguing ground and calls for further research into appropriate methods and instruments for examining this gender relationship between students and teachers in the journalism and mass communication classroom. As an exploratory study, and with its results taken from only one university, the results are neither definitive nor generalizable, yet they can have implications on a broader scale. In the larger context, the shifting of gender balance in the journalism and mass communication classroom, makes this an area ready for further study. With males rating males better and females rating females better, is it possible that with the increase of female students in the classroom senior male professors may be seeing a turn-around in the numbers on their evaluations? If this same-gender interaction effect continues to be borne out, it may lead to

action that forestalls the possible effects of this turn-around in course evaluations, such as a devaluing of their importance. Female enrollment in journalism and mass communication is on the rise. Thus, if this bonding between female students and female professionals is also representative of nationwide trends, then women instructors may be seeing some enviable numbers on their course evaluations. Since student ratings are second only to the chair's evaluations in personnel decisions (Centra, 1977), their construction and weight is a powerful, and as yet underexamined, element in in the evaluation of an instructor for promotion and merit decisions.

This exploration foregrounds many such questions of power. It is possible for someone to shuffle the ranking of teachers. In other words, an administrator could tailor an evaluation or the emphasis that evaluation is given in order to favor or disfavor one or another instructor or group of instructors. The administrator would then have the power to predetermine the ranking of instructors through use of student evaluations.

If this identification between instructors and students of the same gender proves to be such a prominent factor as this study suggests, there are possible implications in addition to gender in terms of, for instance, race and the identification between same-race students and instructors.

References

Arreola, R.A. 1984. Defining and evaluating the elements of teaching. Proceedings of Academic Chairpersons: Evaluating Faculty, Students, and Programs, 1 - 14.

Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. 1989. Women, Men and Media: Next Steps for Journalism and Mass Communication Educators, special report.

Basow, S.A. and N.T. Silberg. 1987. Student evaluations of college professors: Are female and male professors rated differently? Journal of Educational Psychology, 79, 308-14.

Bem, S.L. 1981. Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Professional Manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press Inc. This manual explains the newer, shorter form and elaborates on the original Bem Sex-Role Inventory, which was initially published in the Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.

Bernard, M.E., L.W. Keefauver, G. Elsworth and F.D. Naylor, 1981. Sex-Role behavior and gender in the teacher-student evaluations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73, 681-95.

Bennett, S.1982. Student perceptions and expectations for male and female instructors: Evidence relating to the question of gender bias in teaching evaluation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 170-9.

Cashin, W.E. 1989. Idea Paper No. 20: Student ratings of teaching: A summary of the research. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Manhattan, KS: KS State U.

---. 1988. Idea Paper No. 21: Defining and evaluating college teaching.

---. 1990. Idea Paper No. 22: Student ratings of teaching: Recommendations for use.

Centra, J.A. 1977. How universities evaluate performance: A survey of department heads. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Cooper, P.J., L.P. Stewart and W.B. Gudykunst. 1982. Relationship with instructor and other variables influencing student evaluations of instruction. Communication Quarterly, 30, 308-15.

Elmore, P.B. and K.A. La Pointe. 1974. Effects of teaching sex and the evaluation of college instructors. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66, 386-9.

Fandt, P.M. and G.E. Stevens. 1991. Evaluation bias in the Business Classroom: Evidence Relating to the Effects of Previous Experience. Journal of Psychology, 125 (4), 469-71.

Feldman, K.A. 1986. The perceived instructional effectiveness of college teachers as related to their personality and attitudinal characteristics: A review and synthesis. Research in Higher Education, 24, 129-213.

---. 1983. Seniority and experience of college teachers as related to evaluations they receive from students. Research in Higher Education, 18, 3-124.

Hudson, J.C. 1989. Expected grades correlate with evaluation of teaching. Journalism Educator, 44, 38-44.

Kierstead, D, P. D'Agnostino and H. Dill. 1988. Sex role stereotyping of college professors: Bias in student ratings of instructors. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 342-44.

Lombardo, J. and M.E. Tocci. 1979. Attribution of positive and negative characteristics of instructors. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 48.

Marsh, H.W. 1984. Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases and utility. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 707-754.

--- and J.E. Ware. 1982. Effects of expressiveness, content coverage and incentive on multidimensional student rating scales: New interpretations of the Dr. Fox Effect. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 1126-34.

Martin, H.J. and N.V. Ramanaiah. 1988. Confirmatory factor analysis of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Psychology Reports, 62, 343-50.

Rakow, L. 1991. Gender and race in the classroom: Teaching way out of line. Feminist Teacher, 6, 10-13.

Sallinen-Kuparinen, A. 1992. Teacher communicator style. Communication Education, 41, 153-66.

Spence, J.T. 1991. Do the BSRI and PAQ measure the same or different concepts? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15, 141-65.

Schamber, L. 1989. Women in mass communication education: Who is teaching tommorrow's communicators? in Creedon, P. J., ed., Women in Mass Communication: Challenging Gender Values. Newbury Park, CA: Sage: 148.

Schmitt, B.H. and R.T. Millard. 1988. Construct validity of the Bem sex role inventory (BSRI) Does the BSRI distinguish between gender-schematic and gender-aschematic individuals? Sex-Roles, 19, 581-88.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1988. Labor Force Statistics Derived from the Current Population Survey, 1948-87, Bulletin 2307. Washington, D.C.: GPO.

Wilson, D. and K.G. Wilson, Jr. 1976. Student Ratings of Instruction. Journal of Higher Education, 47: 465-70.

Yanico, B.J. 1985. BSRI scores: Stability over four years for college women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 277-83.